AY 1999/2000 SEC meeting minutes: 00 Mar 08

Faculty Senate
SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 8, 2000

MINUTES

Present: Jesse Binford, Jim Carey, Mary Evans, Suresh Khator, William Janssen, Ona Riggin, Ed Silbert, Pamela Tucker, Nancy Tyson, Jim Vantine, Fredric Zerla

President's Office: Jose Porteiro

Provost's Office: Phil Smith, Tennyson Wright

Guests: Barbara Loeding, Jo Ann Moore, Victor Peppard

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. The Minutes from the meeting of February 2, 2000 were approved as presented.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS (Jesse Binford)

President Binford received a letter from Ms. Marie Hunniecutt, Director of Parking Services, in which she states that permission has been granted for the implementation of three parking spaces north of the library for faculty library parking needs. Ms. Hunniecutt's letter pointed out that these spaces will be located at the east end of the drive in front of the library, and will provide two hours of parking for vehicles with a green staff parking permit displayed. This change should be effective within one week.

President Binford presented the results of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) straw poll regarding whether or not to limit faculty and staff to parking on the first five floors of the Crescent Hill Parking Garage, and allowing only resident students to park on the sixth floor. The outcome was that the majority of the respondents wanted faculty to have access to all floors, which is currently the situation. President Binford will share this information with Ms. Hunniecutt.

President Binford announced that he had received a copy of notification of a change of grade he had made for a student. He noted that one flaw in the process was that the change of grade report had stopped at the department secretary's desk. President Binford will notify the Registrar's Office that the change of grade should be sent to the faculty involved and not just to the department secretary.

PROVOST'S REPORT (Tennyson Wright)
Provost Tighe was attending a meeting of the Council of Academic Vice Presidents in Tallahassee; therefore, Vice Provost Tennyson Wright was present at today's meeting to give a report on his behalf. Vice Provost Wright's report consisted of the following announcements:

- The Governor has not included in the current budget the salary compression funds which the Chancellor, Presidents and Vice Presidents have supported for the last two years. The Legislature may take exception to the Governor's decision and include the funds, but it is too early to tell. The University of South Florida's (USF) position will continue to be one of support for salary compression funds, or salary enhancement, and it will continue to be a part of USF's Legislative budget request. The same position will continue to be supported through the Council of Academic Vice Presidents, as well as the President's Council.

- Assistant Provost Phil Smith was asked to report on the allocation of market equity funds. He indicated that the salary enhancement package that appears in the collective bargaining agreement was also not funded. The dollars that are going into market equity this year are the performance incentive dollars which came about as a consequence of the formula approved by the Legislature last year. It was agreed that the appropriated funds would be spent on salaries in compliance with the terms of the bargaining agreement. The problem is that the determination of each university's share of the appropriation has not been resolved. However, a tentative allocation has been received and the issue will be on the agenda for the Council of Academic Vice Presidents. USF will receive approximately $350,000 on the Academic Affairs/non-Health Sciences side of the university and approximately $50,000 on the Health Sciences side. More information will be available in a few weeks. This performance incentive money is for the 1999/2000 salary process for distribution this year and it will be retroactive to August, 1999.

President Binford asked if it would be beneficial to have a resolution from the Faculty Senate encouraging the Chancellor to do whatever he can to restore the general salary enhancement funds in the Governor's budget. Dr. Silbert pointed out that there are people who represent the faculty at the Legislative session and any bargaining should be left up to those individuals. He indicated that if the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates draws up a resolution, then USF should go along with it. Dr. Silbert suggested that the most direct route would be to get in touch with the liaison who represents USF and let that individual know that the faculty object to the funds being cut from the budget. It was agreed to wait and see if a resolution is proposed by the Advisory Council of Faculty Senates.

- Three candidates for the Dean of the School of Architecture will be interviewed on March 20 and 27, 2000. Interview schedules will be distributed to members of the Faculty Senate who will be invited to interview the candidates. • Vice President of University Advancement Kathy Stafford has resigned to take a job at the University of Houston effective May 1, 2000.

- The Provost has been updated on the Addendum to the report of the Faculty Senate Ad-Hoc Committee on Broadcasting Recommendations. As this issue will be on the agenda for the March Faculty Senate meeting, the Provost has indicated that he will be happy to respond during or after the discussion. He would like to share with the Senate how the process occurred which resulted in transferring Public Broadcasting to University Advancement.

**REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE CHAIRS**
a. Senate Elections (Jim Vastine)

Secretary Vastine distributed the Nomination Report for the 2000-2001 Faculty Senate elections. The College of Engineering is the only area which required a ballot to determine their representative. The Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Education, Nursing, and the Libraries had the same number of nominations as vacancies so those individuals were automatically seated. Secretary Vastine pointed out that there are eight voting units which did not come up with enough nominees to fill the vacancies for next year. He asked for feedback on how to handle this situation to try and make sure that these voting units have representation on the Senate. Discussion was held and it was agreed that Secretary Vastine and Committee on Committees (COC) Chair Pam Tucker will get in touch with COC representatives and ask them to contact colleagues via electronic mail.

Dr. Silbert raised the issue of the way in which faculty assignments are made within the colleges in terms of faculty governance. Discussion was held about the possibility of a change of philosophy taking place within some colleges causing a lack of response for representatives to serve on the Faculty Senate, as well as on the Standing Committees and Councils. It was recommended that President Binford contact the Dean of the College of Business, specifically, in an attempt to find out what might have taken place within the college to change the lack of response from the faculty.

b. Committee on Committees (Pam Tucker)

Chair Tucker presented for approval nominations for the Faculty Senate Standing Committees and Councils along with nominations for the President's Committees and Councils. In addition, the COC approved a change to the charge of the Instructional Technology Council which Chair Tucker also presented for the SEC's approval. The motion was made and seconded to approve and forward to the Faculty Senate the COC nominations. The motion was unanimously passed.

Discussion was held regarding the change to the charge of the Instructional Technology Council. Assistant Provost Smith raised the question regarding the section pertaining to the interests of faculty with respect to rights to intellectual property and whether or not there has been any discussion about this with the United Faculty of Florida (UFF). He pointed out that there is a collective bargaining article that deals with intellectual property rights and there is a certain proprietary interest on the part of the UFF in this area. Dr. Jim Carey, Chair of the Instructional Technology Council, responded that the Council did not consult with the UFF in preparing the wording of this section. He indicated that he was familiar with the portion of the collective bargaining agreement which also appears in the Faculty Handbook and does not see a conflict between what appears in the handbook and a piece of the charge to the Instructional Technology Council. Assistant Provost Smith suggested it might be beneficial to consult with the UFF with respect to how they see their rights and responsibilities in this area in terms of representing faculty. President Binford suggested that a copy of the proposed charge be sent to the UFF and to inform them that this issue will be on the Faculty Senate agenda for the March meeting.

Dr. Tyson announced that she will be attending a UFF meeting later in the week and would be willing to provide them with a copy at that time. Dr. Carey indicated that the Instructional Technology Council has an April meeting scheduled at which questions related to this very topic will be addressed. Also at this meeting will be representation from the research area, Office of the General Counsel, and the UFF.
President Binford asked Dr. Tyson to provide a copy of the proposed charge to the UFF and asked that if there is something to which they object, they should contact him. The motion was made and seconded to include the proposed Instructional Technology Council charge on the agenda for the March Faculty Senate meeting. The motion was unanimously passed.

OLD BUSINESS

Addendum to Report of Faculty Senate Ad-Hoc Committee on Broadcasting Recommendations (Victor Peppard)

Dr. Victor Peppard, Chair of the Faculty Senate Ad-Hoc Committee on Broadcasting Recommendations (CBR), attended today's meeting to provide justification for the following addendum:

"The committee agrees that at the present time the best place to assign the management of the university broadcast stations is at the highest level of the university, that is, directly to the President."

Dr. Peppard reported that the reason for the addendum is that after the recommendations were submitted to the SEC, members of the CBR continued to discuss the report. In addition, the School of Mass Communications (SMC) passed a resolution in which 12 out of 14 faculty voted that they did not have confidence in the shift of management of the stations from Academic Affairs to University Advancement. Dr. Peppard indicated that the faculty vote comes very close to the initial CBR report. Therefore, the CBR members felt it appropriate to make their own recommendation about to whom the stations should report, which resulted in the aforementioned addendum. Dr. Peppard clarified that the rationale for the addendum is that between the initial report from the CBR and the SMC vote of no confidence, the CBR felt another alternative should be proposed.

Discussion was held regarding the three recommendations made by the CBR in their report. Dr. Peppard indicated the first recommendation is in effect with the creation of an advisory board. The second recommendation addresses the issue of employment and contracts which would make explicit guarantees of editorial autonomy for all the professional staff at the stations. The third recommendation is an ombudsman to oversee all of the activities. Dr. Peppard pointed out that all three of these recommendations should remain in effect wherever the stations report. The addendum is a new element of the CBR report because it was never stated that the stations should report to someone or someplace. In the addendum, the CBR recommends that the stations should report directly to the President and not to the Vice President of University Advancement.

Dr. Peppard clarified that the controversy lies in the shift of management of the stations in 1998 from Academic Affairs to University Advancement. Vice Provost Wright added that the Provost had indicated to him that there was faculty input at the time of the transfer. Dr. Peppard responded that his understanding of the sequence of events is that the transfer was made and then the Provost came to the faculty of SMC and discussed it with them. He added that the CBR report states that in an instance like this faculty should be consulted before the transfer which is the way faculty governance should operate. Vice President Khator asked Dr. Peppard why the CBR needs an ombudsman person for the stations separate from the one for the university. Dr. Peppard responded that the CBR is attempting to give the stations as much academic and editorial freedom as possible so that the professional staff knows that he/she has as much safety to do the things they need to and not worry about to whom they are reporting. Dr. Porteiro informed Dr. Peppard that he is the ombudsman and reports directly to the President. Dr. Peppard will confer with the CBR to
find out what their rationale was in making this recommendation. The motion was made and seconded to put this addendum on the agenda for the March Faculty Senate meeting. The motion was unanimously passed.

NEW BUSINESS

a. Faculty and Staff Annual Campaign

President Binford has received a request from Mr. Andrian Cuarta, Chair of the Faculty/Staff Annual Campaign, to give a short presentation at the March Faculty Senate meeting. It was agreed to allow Mr. Cuarta 5 minutes for his presentation.

b. Equal Opportunity Committee Survey Request (Jo Ann Moore)

Ms. Jo Ann Moore, Chair of the Equal Opportunity Committee (EOC) which reports to the President of the University, attended today's meeting to ask permission to present and distribute a survey at the March Faculty Senate meeting. One of the charges of the EOC is to provide feedback to the President on issues affecting equal opportunity on campus. The one-page survey is designed to find out what kinds of EOC matters affect the university. The survey also covers issues the EOC felt were important relating to equal opportunity affairs and sexual harassment. Ms. Moore indicated that the survey has already been distributed to the Administrative and Professional Council, the USPS Senate, the Equal Opportunity Liaison, and members of student government.

SEC members expressed concern that the Faculty Senate is a small group and the EOC may not get the kind of results they are looking for. Dr. Riggin suggested that, in addition to sampling the Faculty Senate, the EOC could also put the survey out on electronic mail for the whole university. Ms. Moore responded that the EOC has budget and staff limitations, and that they are aware of the fact that the groups surveyed are a select sample of the university. President Binford asked that Ms. Moore explain to the Faculty Senate why it is important for them to provide the requested information. Dr. Carey suggested that if the form could be set up on the appropriate web site, an electronic message could be sent with a link for access. The motion was made and seconded to add this item to the agenda of the March Faculty Senate meeting. The motion was unanimously passed.

c. Mid-Term Grade Resolution (Barbara Loeding)

In response to an electronic message sent out by Undergraduate Studies Dean Sullins regarding mid-term grades, Senator Loeding composed the following resolution:

MID-TERM GRADE RESOLUTION
SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATION TO THE FACULTY SENATE

March 22, 2000

The Senate Executive Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate support the following resolution:

Whereas, one of the crucial roles of a professor is to give students feedback on how they are progressing in mastering the skills and knowledge in each course, and
Whereas, students can benefit from receiving this valuable type of feedback on a regular basis, and

Whereas, students need this information before the Drop date to decide whether or not to continue taking each course, and

Whereas, freshman may not be as adept at judging their course grade as other students.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate reaffirms the USF mid-term grade policy that faculty give freshmen feedback regarding their grade by the first day of the 8th week of the term and urges all faculty to comply even if it means they have to give and grade additional assignments earlier in the term.

Senator Loeding indicated that the purpose of the resolution is two-fold: (1) to provide support for Dean Sullins request that freshmen be given feedback regarding their grades, and (2) to have the Faculty Senate discuss the issues that are inherent within the resolution.

Discussion was held and a major concern was how to inform faculty of the due date for conducting mid-term examinations. Dr. Zerla recommended that faculty should be informed at the beginning of the semester when the mid-term grades are due. President Binford recommended that the information be included in the Schedule of Courses as to when mid-term grades are due for freshmen. President Binford also asked Senator Loeding to find out which week mid-term grades are due and include it in the final resolution. Dr. Silbert recommended to Senator Loeding that the due date should also be published in the faculty calendar. The motion was made and seconded to include the Mid-Term Grade Resolution on the agenda for the March Faculty Senate meeting. The motion was unanimously passed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.